

**REMARKS**

Prior to entry of this amendment, Claims 1-21 were pending in the application. By this amendment, Claims 2 and 15 are canceled and Claims 22-33 are added. Hence, Claims 1, 3-14, and 16-33 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 3-9, 14, and 16-21 are amended herein.

In the specification, the paragraph starting at page 25, line 24 is amended to be consistent with the drawings, by removing the reference to identifier “513” which does not appear in FIG. 5.

**SUMMARY OF OFFICE ACTION**

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13-15, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Kekic et al.* (“*Kekic*”; U.S. Pat. No. 6,664,978) in view of *Paulsen et al.* (“*Paulsen*”; U.S. Pat. No. 6,055,575) in further view of *Harrison et al.* (“*Harrison*”; U.S. Pat. No. 6,539,483);

Claims 3 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Kekic* in view of *Paulsen* in further view of *Harrison* in further view of RFC 2571, “An Architecture for Describing SNMP Management Frameworks”, written by D. Harrington (“*Harrington*”);

Claims 4, 8, 11 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Kekic* in view of *Paulsen* in further view of *Harrison* in further view of RFC 2575, “View-based Access Control Model for the Simple Network Management Protocol”, written by B. Wijnen (“*Wijnen*”);

Claims 5, 12 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Kekic* in view of *Paulsen* in further view of *Harrison* in further view of *Luciani et al.* (“*Luciani*”; U.S. Pat. No. 6,614,791);

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Kekic* in view of *Paulsen*; and

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Kekic* in view of *Luciani*.

#### REJECTIONS BASED ON PRIOR ART

##### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent Claims 1, 9, 14, 19 and 20 are amended herein to clarify the interaction between network devices participating in a particular virtual private network (VPN), and the use of data structures stored at each of the network devices. No possible combination of the cited references which might read on these independent claims is fairly taught or suggested in the cited references, or would make these independent claims obvious based on the knowledge of a skilled artisan. Therefore, Claims 1, 9, 14, 19 and 20 are patentable over the cited references of record.

For example, none of the cited references teach or suggest at least the following features of Claims 1 and 14 (with underline added), where Claims 9, 19 and 20 recite generally similar features:

a network manager and a managed network device agreeing on a first mapping between  
securityNames and virtual private network identifiers;  
storing, at the network manager, a translation table containing the first mapping of  
securityName values to corresponding virtual private network identifiers;

wherein the request contains a particular securityName value that is mapped to the particular virtual private network identifier in the first mapping;

at the managed network device, extracting the particular securityName value from the request and identifying, based on the particular securityName value that is mapped in the second mapping, one or more corresponding particular MIB (Management Information Base) Views.

Dependent Claims 3-8, 10-13, 16-18 and 22-33 depend, either directly or indirectly, from one of Claims 1, 9, 14, and 20. Therefore, these claims are patentable over the entire group of references of record for at least the same reasons as the claims from which each of these dependent claims respectively depends.

Furthermore, each of the dependent claims includes at least one other feature that makes it further patentable over the references of record. However, due to the fundamental difference between Claim 1 and *Kekic* in view of *Paulsen* in further view of *Harrison* discussed above, discussion of these additional differences is unnecessary and is foregone at this time. However, the rejection of each of the dependent claims is collectively traversed, and no statements of official notice, overarching allegations of obviousness, or allegations of well-known features that may be present in the Office Action are stipulated to or admitted as prior art features, and the right to separately argue such features in the future is not disclaimed.

Based on the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 1, 3-14, and 16-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is requested.

### NEW CLAIMS

New Claims 22-33 are added to claim embodiments of the invention described in the application as filed. No new matter is introduced in the application by way of these new claims.

In view of the deficiencies in the teachings of the cited references presented above, the additional features recited in Claims 22-33 are not disclosed, suggested or motivated by the cited references. Hence, Claims 22-33 are patentable over the cited references of record.

### CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons indicated above, Applicants submit that all of the pending claims present patentable subject matter over the references of record, and are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner has questions regarding this case, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortages in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully Submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: 2/1/06

John D. Henkhaus  
John D. Henkhaus  
Reg. No. 42,656

(408) 414-1080  
Fax: (408) 414-1076  
2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550  
San Jose, CA 95110-1089

#### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on 2/1/06 by Darci Sakamoto  
Darci Sakamoto